



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/817,632 | 04/02/2004 | Anders Landin | 5181-95501 | 2854 |
| 35690 7590 02/26/2007 MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. 700 LAVACA, SUITE 800 AUSTIN, TX 78701 | | | EXAMINER DOAN, DUC T | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2188 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 02/26/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/817,632

Applicant(s)

LANDIN ET AL.

Examiner

Duc T. Doan

Art Unit

2188

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: 6 and 15.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 8, 10-14 and 16-20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


HYUNG SOUH
SUPERVISOR/EXAMINER
2-22-07

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's IDS filed 1/29/07 is not considered, because it failed rule MPEP 1.97(e).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendments/arguments filed 1/29/2007 have been fully considered with the results as follows,

A) Regarding the objections on claims 1,10 in the previous office action, Applicant's amendments in claims 1 and 10 that indicate the status of the claims as "previously presented" overcome the objections in these claims. Therefore Examiner withdraws the objections on these claims.

B) Regarding the arguments on pages 7-12 for the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), Applicant argues in page 11 that the references do not teach the claim 1's limitation of "translation information identifying a translation function". Examiner maintains that Chi teaches a translation function that is translating addresses between global address space and local address spaces of memories being shared in a multi processor clustering system (see Chi's Fig 7, translation function between a global memory address space and destination node's local address space). In order to carrying out this address translation function in each node, it requires translation information such as Fig 8: #114 node ID, #110 partition number that corresponds to the claim's translation information. The actions to perform the address translation function are disclosed in Chi's Fig 8 that corresponds to the claim's limitation "performing a translation function in response o the translation information". Chi's Fig 8, column 5 lines 27-46 further discloses the data structures in each node storing the translation information such as Fig 8: #112 that includes #110 partition number, #114 node ID, #104 offset (corresponding to the claim's storing the translation information). These translation information are used to carrying out the address translation function, for example using the partition number #110 to indexing the ATM table and obtaining the address in the destination's local address space, see Fig 8: #120 and column 5 lines 28-47.